

common areas in accordance with ULDC standards. Some of the conditions being proposed, a ten (10) foot buffer, meaning a tree every ten feet. Mr. Dillard read the notes attached to the site plan:

1. Lot lines shown are for graphical purposes only. Lots will not be subdivided or sold individually. Property will remain single ownership.
2. Each home shall be connected to Lowndes County Utilities.
3. Paving for internal access drives shall be constructed to county standards and will be privately maintained.
4. Each home shall have 2 parking spaces in compliance with section 6.01.03.
5. Development shall conform with section 4.03.26 and 4.06.00.
6. Site lighting is planned to be expanded and provided in the community and shall be directed away from adjacent properties.
7. All exterior homes shall be placed a minimum of 30' from outer property boundary.
8. The community identification sign shall conform with 4.03.26K.
9. There shall be a non-encroachment easement along Val-Del Road with the exception of the drive entrances.
10. Other development standards not listed or shown shall be governed by suburban density residential (r-10) standards.
11. One tree will be required for every 3 lots in addition to buffer planting requirements.
12. On street parking will not be allowed.
13. The pedestrian pathway to be all-weather surfaces.

The TRC analyzed the request, the standards governing the exercise of zoning power set forth in 10.01.05 of the ULDC, and factors most relevant to this application, including the neighboring land uses and lot sizes, the property's history and future development plans, the availability of County Utilities, the compliance with the supplemental standards of the ULDC, and the potential environmental impacts, and therefore generally recommends approval of the request for P-D zoning per the site plan.

At the GLPC meeting, the applicant's engineer spoke in support of the request, talking through the differences in the proposed site plan, Staff's initial comments about its conformity with the ULDC, and the GLPC questions about ingress/egress, emergency services accessibility, overall security and privacy of the property, and the landscaping and buffering requirements against the surrounding properties.

An additional citizen spoke in support of the request, praising the expansion of an affordable housing option in the area, while one neighbor spoke in opposition, mainly about buffering and density as it relates to traffic concerns in the area. The Planning Commission initially motioned and voted to recommend tabling the request until an updated site plan for their review could be provided. However, the motion failed (4-5). A second motion to recommend denial, based on an incomplete site plan for their review ultimately passed unanimously (9-0). The applicant's engineer provided an updated site